IN THE TITLE:

Please amend the title to:

--CONSTRUCTION OF SYSTEM UTILIZING INFORMATION STORED IN SOLUTION

BANK--.

REMARKS

On page 2, numbered paragraph 3, of the Office Action, the title of the invention is

objected to. The title has been amended to be more descriptive. Reconsideration and

withdrawal of the objection to the title is respectfully requested.

On page 2, numbered paragraph 4, the drawings are objected to because Figs. 1-3 show

only that which is know. Please see the enclosed Request for Approval of Drawing

Corrections in which Figs. 1-3 have been labeled with "Related Art." Reconsideration and

withdrawal of the objection to Figs. 1-3 is respectfully requested.

On page 3, numbered paragraph 7, of the Office Action, claims 1-16 are rejected under

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being disclosed by U.S. Patent No. 5,548,506 to Srinivasan. The

rejection is respectfully traversed.

Srinivasan teaches the Auto Multi-Project Server ("AMPS") which is used as support

for project management applications. In the AMPS, project information, such as project

names, leader names, task names, current situations and so on, are stored in the server as a

database. Project members can then access the server by e-mail or fax so as to check the

progress of the project. The specification defines know-how as at least components, formats

and designs relating to a project. Srinivasan teaches to store information about the people,

places, tasks and times associated with a project. Thus, Srinivasan teaches that those accessing

the database can tell how long a project took, or the persons who accomplished a given task.

Srinivasan does not teach or anticipate storing exemplary information on accomplishing the

task. Thus, Srinivasan neither teaches nor anticipates "storing information including

development situations, know-how, and knowledge in a solution bank by a unit of a solution

pattern" as claimed in claim 1.

Claims 9 and 16 are allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above in relation

to claim 1. Claims 2-8 and 10-15 are allowable as dependent on claims 1 and 9 respectively,

as well as for the additional features recited therein. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the

rejection of claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is respectfully requested.

On page 3, numbered paragraph 7, of the Office Action, claims 1, 9 and 16 are also

rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by U.S. Patent No. 5,535,338 to Takeda. The rejection is

respectfully traversed.

Takeda teaches a system which automatically collects and processes management

information at the time of creation of a specification in system development. Takeda is similar

to Srinivasan above. Takeda does not allow project members to join a project and reference

the database for detailed information about a project such that the new team members have

access through the database to information that is directly used for constructing a system.

Thus, Takeda neither teaches nor anticipates "storing information, including development situations, know-how, and knowledge in a solution bank by a unit of a solution pattern" as claimed in claim 1.

Claims 9 and 16 are allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above in relation to claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 9 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is respectfully requested.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that affect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

By:_____
Heath E. Wells
Registration No. 43,257

700 Eleventh Street, NW
Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 434-1500

Date: December 21, 2000

- 4 -